

REMARKS

Claim 46 has been amended. Claims 6, 21, and 36 were canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-5, 7-20, 22-35, and 37-59 are pending.

Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,056) in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,743). Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-35, 37-40, 42-45, 47-54, and 56-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura in view of Suzuki and Abkowitz (U.S. Publication 2001/0041973). Claims 11, 26, 41, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura in view of Suzuki, Abkowitz, and Paroz (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 31 recite, *inter alia*, “downloading an application from the host device to the communication device; providing a user interface for said application only on said host device; and executing said application on said communication device.”

Claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, “means for downloading an application from the host device to the communication device; means for providing a user interface for said application only on said host device.”

Claim 46 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein: said host device is configured to download an application from the host device to the communication device; provide a user interface for said application only on said host device.”

Ogura discloses an information processing terminal having a folded structure. The folded structure includes a first housing element has a form factor consistent with the PCMCIA card standard, thereby permitting the first housing element to accommodate a PCMCIA card, and a second housing element containing a data processing element. See, e.g., Fig. 1. The Office Action specifically cites to column 2, lines 29-41, which is a fragment of one paragraph. The entire paragraph of the cited portion is quoted below:

"IBM ChipCard VW-200" PC card sold by IBM Japan (hereinafter simply referred to as "VW-200") employs a foldable structure comprising a first housing which conforms to the Type-II form factor

of PCMCIA/JEIDA and a second housing which is pivotally hinged on one edge of the first housing (see FIG. 7). VW-200 is provided with a self running function similar to TC-100. Namely, it is used as a memory card when it is inserted into the card slot of the PC while it behaves as a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) under the control of the internal CPU when it is removed from the card slot. A PCMCIA connector is provided on the other edge of the first housing for electrical connection to the card slot of the PC. When VW-200 is unfolded, it can be inserted to the card slot as a Type-II card while it is inserted into the card slot as a Type-III card when it is folded. The majority of the top surface of the first housing is allocated to a key input area where the number of keys is more than TC-100 and the key top is larger allowing an easy input manipulation by a user. A relatively large liquid crystal display (STN monochrome) of 200x320 dots resolution is provided on the surface of the second housing to enhance the display capability over TC-100. A Kanji ROM is also integrated therein to support Kanji display function (16 dots font, double sized 12 characters x 20 lines). (emphasis supplied)

As shown in Fig. 7, Ogura discloses that the IBM ChipCard VW-200 is a foldable dual function device. In a folded configuration, it can be plugged into a computer having a Type-III PCMCIA card slot and operate as a memory device for the computer. Alternatively, the ChipCard can be unfolded where it can operate as a PDA, due to its internal processor, keyboard interface, and display.

The Office Action states that it is well known that “a memory card can be used to store transferred data from a PC, such as applications, and that applications run from a memory card will only be displayed on a host device.” Based upon this assumption, the Office Action concludes the Ogura discloses every element of the subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 except for “executing the application on the communications device.”

It is respectfully asserted that the Office Action is in error. In fact, Ogura does disclose running applications on the communication device. On the assumption that the IBM ChipCard itself is a communications device, Ogura discloses that the ChipCard operates as a PDA under the control of its own internal CPU when the ChipCard is unfolded and not coupled to a host machine. As PDAs are well known for being able to execute applications, it is respectfully asserted that Ogura does in fact disclose executing applications on the communications device. However, the

system described in Ogura differs from the claimed invention insofar as the ChipCard includes its own keyboard and display, which are used to provide a user interface for applications running on the ChipCard. Thus, Ogura fails to disclose or suggest the above quoted limitations of the independent claims, especially with respect to providing “a user interface for said application only on said host device.”

Further, it should be noted that the Office Action’s statement that it is well known that “a memory card can be used to store transferred data from a PC, such as applications, and that applications run from a memory card will only be displayed on a host device,” is entirely irrelevant to the claimed invention because when the ChipCard is used as a memory for a PC, the ChipCard functions solely as a memory device and performs no data processing of its own. Accordingly, the application is executed on the PC, and the PC provides for the user interface to the application, but these are the actions normally performed by a PC and not related to the subject matter recited in the above quoted portions of the independent claims.

Suzuki is directed to a PDA workspace interface using application icons. Referring to Fig. 1, Suzuki discloses coupling the PDA 1 via a communications network N to a host 20. The PDA is associated with a small capacity memory device 6, while the host is associated with a large capacity storage device 26. Applications and data may be downloaded from the host 20 to the PDA 1. Column 5, lines 26-31. Once an application for the PDA 1 has been downloaded from the host 20, the application can be executed on the PDA 1. Id., at lines 30-31. Suzuki discloses that the results of the application can be displayed on the PDA 1. Column 5, lines 37-39. The results of the application can also be stored on the host PC 20. Id. Suzuki, therefore fails to disclose or suggest the above quoted limitations of the independent claims.

The Office Action states that one of ordinary skill familiar with Ogura and Suzuki would find it obvious to arrive at the claimed invention because such a combination would have “the advantage of storing data in accordance with the input instruction and input data of the communications device,” and cites to Suzuki at column 5, lines 31-39. The cited portion is reproduced below:

Subsequently, the CPU 2 stores different types of instructions or data input from the input device 3 in the RAM 4, and thus different types of processing are executed on the basis of the application program file or input data stored in the small capacity memory device 6 in accordance with the input instruction and input data. Then, the result of the process is displayed on the display device 5, and transferred to the host PC 20 via the communication network N to be stored.

(emphasis supplied)

It is respectfully asserted that the advantage stated by the Office Action for the proposed combination is not understood. Should the current rejection be maintained, clarification is requested. However, it is respectfully suggested that the current objection be withdrawn because even the above cited portion of Suzuki states (at the emphasized portion) that the result of the processing is displayed on the display device 5. Referring to Figs. 1 and 2, the display device 5 is a portion of the PDA. Accordingly, even the cited portion of Suzuki discloses that the user interface of the application is provided by the PDA. Accordingly, even the proposed combination would not result in the subject matter recited by the above quoted portions of the independent claims.

The Office Action additionally cites to Paroz and Abkowitz. Paroz discloses a remote control system in which the user interface of a first computing device is analyzed and a logically equivalent user interface is created on a second computing device. Abkowitz discloses using one device to configure and emulate web site content to be displayed on another device. Paroz and Abkowitz disclose systems in which one application is associated with two user interfaces on two devices. Neither Paroz nor Abkowitz, whether taken individually, in combination, or in combination with Ogura and Suzuki, disclose or suggest the above quoted limitations of independent claims 1, 16, 31, and 41.

Independent claims 1, 16, 31 and 46 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. The depending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims. Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated April 24, 2006

:

By: /Robert J. O'Connell/ Reg. No. 44,265

for Christopher S. Chow

Reg. No. 46,493

(858) 845-3249

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502